



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/062,113 | 02/01/2002 | Jeffrey J. Collins | 435 | 9992 |
| 22474 | 7590 10/27/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| DOUGHERTY, CLEMENTS, HOFER, BERNARD & WALKER 1901 ROXBOROUGH ROAD | | | DAGOSTA, STEPHEN M | |
| SUITE 300 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| CHARLOTTI | CHARLOTTE, NC 28211 | | | |

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | 10/062,113 | COLLINS, JEFFREY J. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Stephen M. D'Agosta | 2683 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | J. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Octoor This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E | action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,9-11,15,16,18,19 and 21-24 is 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,9-11,15,16,18,19 and 21-22 is 6) ☐ Claim(s) 23 and 24 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | vn from consideration. l/are allowed. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine | epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | |
| Attachment(s) | 4 \ □ 1-4 1 2 | (PTO 442) | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/062,113

Art Unit: 2683

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10-13-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- 1. Claims 23-24 still stand rejected since these claim amendments were not cited as being novel by the examiner. A new rejection is found below.
- 2. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 9-11, 15-16, 18-19 and 21-22 are allowed. Claims 5, 7-8 and 14 were cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clupper et al. US 6,309,742 and further in view of Allen et al. US 6,410,847 and Webb US 6,542,371 and Eckblad et al. US 6,390,475.

As per **claims 23-24**, Clupper teaches a low EMI emission network device comprising:

A chassis having a door (C1, L23-39 teaches an enclosure, access panels, doors, lids and/or C2, L9-10 teaches a housing);

Electronic components disposed <u>within said chassis</u>, said <u>electronic components</u> comprising at least one integrated circuit <u>running at a clock speed and emitting EMI in the range of 1-3 GHZ (C1, L10 to C2, L40 teaches use of PCB's/circuits that emit EMI and are disposed in a housing/chassis); and</u>

A layer of foam having a high <u>predetermined</u> insertion loss in the range of

Application/Control Number: 10/062,113

Art Unit: 2683

1-10GHz disposed on at least an inner portion of said door (C3, L46 to C4, L17 which teaches a foam substrate with metal coating that can be attached to a device and is used a gasket/EMI shield, also see figure 8 for 1-3GHz range and C1, L34-40 teaches doors, access panels and/or lids of an enclosure/chassis which would be outfitted with EMI foam. Also note that Clupper discloses known EMI/RFI shielding gaskets with "....sufficient electrical conductivity.....to provide excellent EMI shielding in a frequency range from about 10MHz to about 26GHz, while being compatible with the use of lightweight plastic shields, snap features, and thin PCB's". Hence the examiner interprets the disclosure as providing motivation for one skilled to dope the foam to increase Clupper's EMI effectiveness up to the 10GHz range and beyond); and

Wherein said layer of foam is approximately .25 inches in thickness (Clupper teaches a foam thickness of 3mm which is interpreted as reading on "approximately .25 inches" (eg. the thickness is variable) and at least a portion of the EMI is absorbed by said layer of the foam and prevented from exiting the chassis (C1, L65 to C2, L40 teaches use of foam gasket/shielding to prevent EMI from exiting and/or interfering with network device(s))

but is silent on <u>running at clock speed of 1-10GHz range and substantially</u> covering the inner surface of said door and wherein the foam is disposed directly on top of said heat sink,.

The examiner notes that Clupper discloses known EMI/RFI shielding gaskets with "....sufficient electrical conductivity.....to provide excellent EMI shielding in a frequency range from about 10MHz to about 26GHz, while being compatible with the use of lightweight plastic shields, snap features, and thin PCB's". Hence the examiner interprets the disclosure as providing motivation for one skilled to dope the foam to increase Clupper's EMI effectiveness up to the 10GHz range and beyond.

Allen teaches a packaged electronic system with an absorbing cover to reduce EMI (title, abstract, figures 2-3, C3, L4-24). Hence one skilled would either manufacture the cover to have these properties or at least use EMI shielding material to shroud the cover (eg. with a material as disclosed by Clupper).

Art Unit: 2683

Both Webb and Eckblad teach EMI suppressive methods whereby material is placed "near" a neat sink, which reads on the foam being disposed on top of said heat sink. Specifically Webb teaches:

"...a heat sink is mechanically coupled to the heat producing component during operation. Typically, a flat surface of the heat sink will be held against a flat surface of the electrical component using some form of clamp or fastener. As can be appreciated, the surface of the heat sink and the surface of the component will rarely be perfectly planar or smooth, so air gaps will generally exist between the surfaces..." (C1, L44-51)

"...In yet another embodiment, carbon fiber threads are interlaced within a metallic lattice (formed from, for example, thin copper strands) to form the support structure of the pad. Such hybrid fabrics may also be used to provide shielding for electromagnetic interference (EMI) if the corresponding thermal pad is shaped to enclose the circuit package (e.g., an integrated circuit package). Preferably, the carbon fiber fabric will consist of 50% or more of carbon fiber by weight (although smaller ratios are also possible). As will be appreciated by a person of ordinary skill in the art, many alternative hybrid fabric combinations also exist..." (C5, L36-50).

Eckblad teaches (see figure 1):

"....wherein said gasket and said heat sink, in combination with a ground ring in said substrate surface, provide a barrier surrounding-said exposed die to eliminate <u>electromagnetic</u> interference emissions from said exposed die...." (C6,L17-22)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Clupper, such that the layer of foam substantially covers the inner surface of the chassis and operates in the 1-10GHz range and foam on top of the heat sink, to provide maximum EMI protection against any leakage via the chassis and/or openings of said chassis and to provide EMI shielding for electrical components that operate over a wide range of frequencies.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2683

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. D'Agosta whose telephone number is 571-272-7862. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen D'Agosta Primary Examiner

